A Fast Algorithm for the Coordinate-wise Minimum Distance Estimation

Jiwoong Kim

Department of Applied and Computational Mathematical and Statistics
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556
E-mail:jkim66@nd.edu

arXiv:1702.02707v2 [stat.CO] 14 Feb 2017

Abstract

Application of the minimum distance estimation method to the linear regression model for estimating regression parameters is a difficult and time-consuming process due to the complexity of its distance function, and hence, it is computationally expensive. To deal with the computational cost, this paper proposes a fast algorithm which makes the best use of coordinate-wise minimization technique in order to obtain the minimum distance estimators. `R` package based on the proposed algorithm and written in `Rcpp` is available online.

Keywords: Coordinate-wise minimization; linear regression model; minimum distance estimation; Rcpp

1 Introduction

The minimum distance (m.d.) estimation method refers to technique that obtains estimators by minimizing difference — herein called *distance* — between a function obtained from the sample of observations and one from the assumed model. The most common and popular distance used in the literature of the m.d. estimation method is the Cramér-von Mises (CM) type distance. Wolfowitz (1957) used the CM type distance which measures the difference between an empirical distribution function (d.f.) and the assumed model d.f. Using other types of distance, Parr and Schucany (1979) empirically showed robustness of the m.d. estimators of location parameters in the one and two sample location models. Departing from the one sample model, Koul and DeWet (1983) extended domain of applications of the m.d. estimation method to the linear regression model where the regression parameters of interest are estimated by minimizing the CM type distance between weighted empirical residual process and its expectation. All of these works are based on the assumption — which is indeed not practical — that the error d.f. in these models is known. Koul (1985) weakened this assumption by assuming that the error d.f. in the multiple linear regression model is symmetric around the origin. He defined a class of L_2 distances between weighted empirical functions of residuals and negative residuals and a class of estimators that minimize these distances. Using the class of L_2 distances, Koul (2002) demonstrated the m.d. estimators possesses the desirable properties such as asymptotic distributions, efficiency, and robustness.

Despite the merits of the m.d. estimation method, very little research has been done on its computational aspects. Dhar (1991, 1992) demonstrated the existence of the m.d. estimators under certain conditions and discussed a computational procedure for estimating parameters of the linear regression the autoregressive models. However, the discussion about computing the m.d. estimator therein was restricted to the case of two-dimensional parameters only; for the general case he provided only brief description of the procedure which entirely resorts to brute-force search. Considering the huge computational cost of brute-force search, we propose a faster and more efficient algorithm based on coordinate-wise minimization of the distance function. In this paper, the computational aspects of the CM type distance with Lebesgue integration will be investigated. Other types of distances will form a future research. The proposed algorithm in

this paper has a root in the work of Koul (1985, 1986, 2002). `R` package `KoulMde` — based on the proposed algorithm and written in RCPP — is available from Comprehensive `R` Archive Network (CRAN) at `https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/KoulMde/index.html`.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide a detailed description of the proposed algorithm. In Section 3, computational time of the proposed algorithm is reported; a comparison with other algorithms is also provided, and efficiency of the proposed algorithm is demonstrated.

2 Coordinate-wise minimization

One disadvantage of the CM type m.d. estimation method is complexity which arises from minimizing the distance. Koul (1986) showed the complexity could be alleviated by reducing the distance into a simple form; see, e.g., (2.1) below. However, another problem will be encountered after the simple form of the distance is available. As will be shown below, the distance — which is a function of parameters — of the CM type m.d. estimation with Lebesgue integration is not smooth at certain points; it displays abrupt — either obtuse or acute — bends and hence is not differentiable at those. Bearing the direct brunt of the non-differentiability, searching optimal value by a variant of gradient descent method will be slow and inefficient. Therefore, a method which need not necessarily calculate the gradient of the distance will deserve due consideration. To reach the requirement, we come up with an algorithm which coordinate-wisely searches the optimal value by simple comparison: the proposed algorithm is, however, different from brute-force search in that it compares certain values which meet some conditions.

Consider the linear regression model for

$$y_i = \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, ..., n,$$

where $\boldsymbol{x}_i = (x_{i1}, ..., x_{ip})' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, ..., \beta_p)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a parameter vector of interest. Let ε_i's be independently identically distributed random variables. In addition, ε_1 is assumed to be symmetric around zero. As in Koul (1985), we introduce the distance function for $\boldsymbol{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b}) := \sum_{k=1}^{p} \int \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_{ik} \Big\{ I\big(y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{b} \le y\big) - I\big(- y_i + \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{b} < y\big) \Big\} \right]^2 dH(y),$$

where H is a $\sigma-$finite measure on $\mathbb{R}$ and symmetric around 0, i.e., $dH(-x) = -dH(x)$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$; d_{ik} are some real numbers with $1 \le i \le n$ and $1 \le k \le p$; and $I(\cdot)$ is an indicator function. Define a class of the m.d. estimators $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, one for each H, as

$$\mathcal{L}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) := \inf_{\boldsymbol{b}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b}).$$

If H is continuous, then from Koul (2002, p149),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b}) \quad = \quad & \sum_{k=1}^{p} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} d_{ik} d_{jk} \Big[\big| H(y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{b}) - H(-y_j + \boldsymbol{x}_j'\boldsymbol{b}) \big| \\ & \qquad - \big| H(y_i - \boldsymbol{x}_i'\boldsymbol{b}) - H(y_j - \boldsymbol{x}_j'\boldsymbol{b}) \big| \Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

For $H(x) := x$, the distance function can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b}) &= \sum_{k=1}^{p}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} d_{ik}d_{jk}\Big[\,\big|(y_i+y_j)-\boldsymbol{b}'(\boldsymbol{x}_i+\boldsymbol{x}_j)\big| - \big|(y_i-y_j)-\boldsymbol{b}'(\boldsymbol{x}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_j)\big|\,\Big] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} d^*_{ij}\Big[\,\big|y^+_{ij}-\boldsymbol{b}'\boldsymbol{x}^+_{ij}\big| - \big|y^-_{ij}-\boldsymbol{b}'\boldsymbol{x}^-_{ij}\big|\,\Big] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} d^*_{ij}\left[\left|y^+_{ij}-\sum_{k\neq l}(x^+_{ij})_k b_k-(x^+_{ij})_l b_l\right| - \left|y^-_{ij}-\sum_{k\neq l}(x^-_{ij})_k b_k-(x^-_{ij})_l b_l\right|\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&d^*_{ij} := \sum_{k=1}^{p} d_{ik}d_{jk}, \\
&y^+_{ij} := y_i+y_j, \quad y^-_{ij} := y_i-y_j, \\
&\boldsymbol{x}^+_{ij} := \boldsymbol{x}_i+\boldsymbol{x}_j, \quad \boldsymbol{x}^-_{ij} := \boldsymbol{x}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_j,
\end{aligned}$$

and $(x^+_{ij})_k$ and $(x^-_{ij})_k$ are the kth entries of $\boldsymbol{x}^+_{ij}$ and $\boldsymbol{x}^-_{ij}$, respectively. Observe that computational time to calculate $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b})$ for fixed $\boldsymbol{b}\in\mathbb{R}^p$ is $O(n^2)$. For fixed $1\le l\le n$, let

$$e^+_{lij} := \frac{y^+_{ij}-\sum_{k\neq l}(x^+_{ij})_k b_k}{(x^+_{ij})_l}, \quad e^-_{lij} := \frac{y^-_{ij}-\sum_{k\neq l}(x^-_{ij})_k b_k}{(x^-_{ij})_l}, \tag{2.2}$$

if $(x^+_{ij})_l\neq 0$ and $(x^-_{ij})_l\neq 0$. Define

$$X^+_l := \{(x^+_{ij})_l \neq 0:\ 1\le i,j\le n\}, \quad X^-_l := \{x^-_{ij}\neq 0:\ 1\le i,j\le n\}.$$

Accordingly, define

$$\begin{aligned}
&D^+_l := \{d^*_{ij}:\ (x^+_{ij})_l\in X^+_l\}, \quad D^-_l := \{d^*_{ij}:\ (x^-_{ij})_l\in X^-_l\}, \\
&E^+_l := \{e^+_{lij}:\ (x^+_{ij})_l\in X^+_l\}, \quad E^-_l := \{e^-_{lij}:\ (x^-_{ij})_l\in X^-_l\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Let n^+_l and n^-_l — which are both $O(n^2)$ — denote cardinalities of X^+_l and X^-_l, respectively. Note that X^+_l, D^+_l, and E^+_l have the same cardinality; the same fact holds for X^-_l, D^-_l, and E^-_l. For $1\le k\le n^+_l$, let x^+_{lk}, d^+_{lk}, and e^+_{lk} denote the kth largest element of X^+_l, D^+_l, and E^+_l after they are arranged in ascending order; x^-_{lk}, d^-_{lk}, and e^-_{lk} are defined in the same way. We assume that above values have no ties. Finally, $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b})$ can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n^+_l} d^+_{lk}|x^+_{lk}||b_l-e^+_{lk}| - \sum_{k=1}^{n^-_l} d^-_{lk}|x^-_{lk}||b_l-e^-_{lk}| + \sum_{d^*_{ij}\notin D^+_l} d^*_{ij}\Big|y^+_{ij}-\boldsymbol{b}'\boldsymbol{x}^+_{ij}\Big| - \sum_{d^*_{ij}\notin D^-_l} d^*_{ij}\Big|y^-_{ij}-\boldsymbol{b}'\boldsymbol{x}^-_{ij}\Big|.$$

To compute $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{b})$ will be minimized coordinate-wisely. That is, starting with initial value

$$\boldsymbol{b}^0 = (b^0_1,...,b^0_p),$$

we iteratively derive $\boldsymbol{b}^{t+1} := (b_1^{t+1}, ..., b_p^{t+1})$ from $\boldsymbol{b}^t := (b_1^t, ..., b_p^t)$ by solving

$$b_l^{t+1} = \arg\min_{z\in\mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}(b_1^{t+1}, ..., b_{l-1}^{t+1}, z, b_{l+1}^t, ..., b_p^t), \tag{2.3}$$

for $1 \le l \le p$. Let $\boldsymbol{b}_{-l} := (b_1, ..., b_{l-1}, b_{l+1}, ..., b_p)' \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$. Observe that for $z \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}(b_1, ..., b_{l-1}, z, b_{l+1}..., b_p) &= \sum_{k=1}^{n_l^+} d_{lk}^+ |x_{lk}^+||z - e_{lk}^+| - \sum_{k=1}^{n_l^-} d_{lk}^- |x_{lk}^-||z - e_{lk}^-| \\
&\quad + \sum_{d_{ij}^* \notin D_l^+} d_{ij}^* \left| y_{ij}^+ - \boldsymbol{b}'\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}^+ \right| - \sum_{d_{ij}^* \notin D_l^-} d_{ij}^* \left| y_{ij}^- - \boldsymbol{b}'\boldsymbol{x}_{ij}^- \right| \\
&= f(z; \boldsymbol{b}_{-l}) + C,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$f(z; \boldsymbol{b}_{-l}) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_l^+} d_{lk}^+ |x_{lk}^+||z - e_{lk}^+| - \sum_{k=1}^{n_l^-} d_{lk}^- |x_{lk}^-||z - e_{lk}^-|,$$

and C is the sum of last two terms. Therefore, solving (2.3) is equivalent to

$$b_l^{t+1} = \arg\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}} f(x\,; \boldsymbol{b}_{-l}^t), \tag{2.4}$$

for $1 \le l \le p$. For saving the space, write $f_l(\cdot)$ and $f_l^t(\cdot)$ for $f(\cdot\,; \boldsymbol{b}_{-l})$ and $f(\cdot\,; \boldsymbol{b}_{-l}^t)$. Note that e_{lij}^+'s and e_{lij}^-'s in (2.2) are zeros of summands of f_l (not f_l); therefore, f_l displays either obtuse or acute bends at those zeros. When $d_{lk}^- < 0$ for $k = 1, ..., n_l^-$, f_l has obtuse bends at all the zeros, and it is at either quasiconvex or convex; b_l^{t+1}, hence, is the weighted median of the zeros. However, $d_{lk}^- < 0$ for all k and all t is not guaranteed, which implies the convexity of f_l^t does not generally hold: see, e.g., Figure 1 which well illustrates non-convexity of f_l. Define intervals both endpoints of which are the zeros, i.e.,

$$I_{li}^+ := [e_{l,i-1}^+,\ e_{li}^+], \qquad i = 0, 1, ..., (n_l^+ + 1),$$

where $e_{l0}^+ := e_{l1}^+ - 1$ and $e_{l,n_l+1}^+ := e_{ln_l^+}^+ + 1$. Similarly, define

$$I_{lj}^- := [e_{l,j-1}^-,\ e_{lj}^-], \qquad j = 0, 1, ..., (n_l^- + 1),$$

where $e_{l0}^- := e_{l1}^- - 1$ and $e_{l,n_l^-+1}^- := e_{ln_l^-}^- + 1$. Note that f_l is a continuous piecewise linear function; see, e.g., Figure 1-(a). It consists of more than $(n_l^+ + n_l^-)$ pieces of line segments which are defined on I_{li}^+, I_{lj}^+, or $I_{li}^+ \cap I_{lj}^-$; f_l has local minima at e_{li}^+'s or e_{lj}^-'s for some $1 \le i \le n_l^+$ or $1 \le j \le n_l^-$. Hence, f_l has the global minimum at one of those zeros which is hereafter called *optimal zero*. Figure 1-(a) illustrates a part of the graph of f_l which is generated from 100 data points; it contains 11 zeros. Brute-force search suggests that values of f_l at all zeros should be compared. In Figure 1-(a), brute-force search, for example, compares f_l at the first zero (=4.844) with one at the second zero (=4.865). Since f_l attains smaller value at the second zero, the first zero is discarded; by this manner it keeps searching a new zero until smaller f_l is found. Then it updates the previous optimal zero to the new zero. Consequently, the computational cost of brute-force search will be $O(n^4)$ since number of the zeros and the computational time for f_l at one zero are both $O(n^2)$.

Motivated by the fact that f_l is piecewise linear and differentiable over the intervals, the proposed algorithm will find only zeros at which the slope of f_l changes sign from negative to positive; to that end,



(a) $f_l(x)$. (b) $f_l'(x)$.

Figure 1: Example of searching the optimal zero in the coordinate-wise way.

we compute the slopes of the line segments of f_l over intervals between the zeros. For example, Figure 1-(a) illustrates that the first sign change of the slope from negative to positive happens at the third zero (=4.901). According to Figure 1-(a), Figure 1-(b) shows slopes of the line segments of f_l over the intervals between the zeros. Define a set

$$E_l := E_l^+ \cup E_l^+ \cup \{e_{l0}^+, e_{l0}^-, e_{l,n_l+1}^+, e_{l,n_l+1}^-\}.$$

Let n_l denote a cardinality of E_l; maximum value of n_l is therefore $n_l^+ + n_l^- + 4$. Let e_i^l denote the ith element of E_l after it is arranged in ascending order. Define new intervals

$$I_{li} := [e_{i-1}^l,\ e_i^l], \qquad i = 0, 1, ..., (n_l + 1),$$

where $e_0^l := e_1^l - 1$ and $e_{n_l^l+1} := e_{n_l}^l + 1$. Accordingly, define

$$Q_l := \{q_1^l, q_2^l, ..., q_{n_l+1}^l\},$$

where

$$q_i^l = \begin{cases} e_1^l - 1, & \text{if } i = 1; \\ e_{n_l}^l + 1, & \text{if } i = n_l; \\ \frac{e_{i-1}^l + e_i^l}{2}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note that q_i^l is the midpoint of I_{li}, and it will fall into one of I_{lj}^+, I_{lk}^-, or $I_{lj}^+ \cap I_{lk}^-$ for some $1 \le j \le n_l^+$ or $1 \le k \le n_l^-$. In order to find the optimal zero, we, therefore, check the slope of line segments of f_l on I_{li} which is the derivative of f_l at q_i^l. Let f_l' denote the derivative of f_l. Define

$$g(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{n_l^+} d_{lk}^+ |x_{lk}^+||z - e_{lk}^+|, \quad h(z) := \sum_{k=1}^{n_l^-} d_{lk}^- |x_{lk}^-||z - e_{lk}^-|.$$

Let $g'(z)$ and $h'(z)$ denote derivatives of $g(z)$ and $h(z)$, respectively. Then

$$g'(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_l^+} d_{lk}^+ |x_{lk}^+| \text{sgn}(z - e_{lk}^+), \quad h'(z) = \sum_{k=1}^{n_l^-} d_{lk}^- |x_{lk}^-| \text{sgn}(z - e_{lk}^-),$$

where sgn(x) takes 1, 0, or -1 if x is greater than, equal to, or less than 0, respectively. Define two sequences recursively

$$\zeta_{i+1} := \zeta_i + 2d_{li}^+ |x_{li}^+|, \qquad \text{with } \zeta_1 := -\sum_{k=1}^{n_l^+} d_{lk}^+ |x_{lk}^+|,$$

and

$$\eta_{j+1} := \eta_j + 2d_{lj}^- |x_{lj}^-|, \qquad \text{with } \eta_1 := -\sum_{k=1}^{n_l^-} d_{lk}^- |x_{lk}^-|,$$

where $1 \le i \le n_l^+$ and $1 \le j \le n_l^-$. Note that any arbitrary point $q_i^l \in Q_l$ should fall into I_{lj}^+ and I_{lk}^- for some j and k where $1 \le j \le n_l^+$ and $1 \le k \le n_l^-$. Assume $q_i^l \in I_{li_1}^+$ and $q_i \in I_{li_2}^-$ where $0 \le i_1 \le n_l^+$ and $0 \le i_2 \le n_l^-$. Then we have

$$f_l'(q_i^l) = g'(q_i^l) - h'(q_i^l) = \zeta_{i_1} - \eta_{i_2}.$$

Observe that the computational time of the slopes of all the line segments of f_l is $O(n^2)$. Once the slopes of the line segments of f_l are computed, we search the optimal zero as described in the following procedure. We start with checking the first line segment on I_1^l. If the line segment shows a positive slope on I_{l1}, i.e., $f_l'(q_1^l) > 0$, f_l can not have the minimum at e_1^l which is the right endpoint of I_{l1}. Consequently, e_1^l can't be the optimal zero. If the line segment shows a negative slope, then a slope of the adjacent line segment on I_{l2}, i.e., $f_l'(q_2^l)$, will be checked; we keep checking the adjacent line segment until it shows a positive slope. Let I_{li_*} with $1 < i_* < n_l$ denote the first interval on which the line segment displays a positive slope, i.e., $f_l'(q_{i_*}^l) > 0$. Then $e_{i_*-1}^l$ which is the right endpoint of I_{l,i_*-1} (the interval of the last line segment with a negative slope) will be listed as a potential optimal zero. We repeat the previous procedure until the last line segment on $I_{n_l}^l$ is checked. Define

$$\mathcal{I}_l^t := \{i : \, q_i^l \in Q_l \;\text{ such that }\; f'(q_i^l; \boldsymbol{b}_{-l}^t) < 0 \text{ and } f'(q_{i+1}^l; \boldsymbol{b}_{-l}^t) > 0\},$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}_l^t := \{e_i^l = (q_i^l + q_{i+1}^l)/2 : \; i \in \mathcal{I}_l^t\}.$$

Then (2.4) is equivalent to

$$b_l^{t+1} = \arg\min_{e \in \mathcal{E}_l^t} f(e\,; \boldsymbol{b}_{-l}^t). \tag{2.5}$$

Let C_n denote a cardinality of $\mathcal{E}_l^t$. Since the computational time of f_l is $O(n^2)$, the computational cost of the proposed algorithm will be $O(C_n \cdot n^2)$. C_n does not have a mathematical expression; in the next section, it will be empirically shown that the computational cost of the proposed algorithm is $O(n^2)$. Finally, we conclude this section by summarizing the proposed algorithm:

The proposed algorithm:

Choose an initial $\boldsymbol{b}^0$.

While convergence is reached:

for $l = 1$ to p

find E_l and Q_l
find $\{\zeta_i : i = 1, ..., n_l^+\}$ and $\{\eta_j : 1 \leq j \leq n_l^-\}$
calculate f_l' at each point of Q_l
find the dimension-wise optimal zero through solving (2.5)
update b_l to the the optimal zero
end for
end while

3 Computational time

Recall that the computational cost of the proposed algorithm does not have a mathematical expression. In this section, we demonstrate that it is empirically $O(n^2)$. We implement the proposed algorithm in `R`. It is run 1,000 times for different sample size n with $p = 4$; Table 1 reports our findings of the empirical result. As reported in the table below, the computational time of the proposed algorithm is linear in n^2, which

n	time (CPU seconds)	time/n ($\times 10^{-3}$)	time/n^2 ($\times 10^{-4}$)	time/n^3 ($\times 10^{-5}$)	time/n^4 ($\times 10^{-6}$)
20	0.088	4.411	2.205	1.102	5.514
40	0.315	7.898	1.974	0.493	0.1234
60	0.701	11.693	1.948	0.324	0.0541
80	1.235	15.443	1.930	0.241	0.030
100	1.907	19.074	1.907	0.190	0.019
120	2.759	22.999	1.916	0.159	0.013
140	3.730	26.643	1.903	0.139	0.009
160	4.855	30.348	1.896	0.118	0.007
180	6.188	34.382	1.910	0.106	0.005
200	7.597	37.985	1.899	0.094	0.004

Table 1: Computational time and time/n^k of the proposed algorithm with $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

is approximately $1.9 \times 10^{-4} \times n^2$. Therefore, the proposed algorithm is $O(n^2)$ times more efficient than brute-force search.

Next, we compare the proposed algorithm with others: Nelder and Mead (NM), Broyden-Fletcher-Goldfarb-Shanno (BFGS), Limited-memory BFGS (L-BFGS-B), and conjugate gradient (CG). We also compare the proposed algorithm implemented in `R` (PR) with one implemented in `Rcpp` (PRCPP). Table 2 reports the computational times taken by six algorithms. As reported in the table, the proposed algorithm

n	NM	BFGS	CG	L-BFGS-B	PR	PRCPP
50	26.749	18.259	18.205	39.707	0.461	0.020
100	92.088	65.002	75.271	146.470	1.795	0.075
150	190.420	145.771	194.086	313.493	3.970	0.171
200	315.627	241.815	341.714	527.445	7.119	0.226

Table 2: Computational times of six algorithms for various sample size n.

is apparently superior to others regardless of n: for example, when n is 200, it is approximately 40, 30, 50 and 70 times faster than BFGS, NM and CG, and L–BFGS–B, respectively. Table 2 also illustrates a typical bottleneck in `R` — which is caused by double-loop in the distance function as seen in (2.1) — as n

increases. We redress this technical issue by employing PRCPP rather than PR. As reported in the table above, PRCPP dramatically reduces the computational cost; it is 20 or more faster than PR.

Figure 2 shows average computational times of the PRCPP over 1,000 runs for different values of n and p. The right panel shows CPU time when n varies from 100 to 1000 with $p = 10$ while p varies from 4 to 50



Figure 2: Computational times of PRCPP of different n and p.

with $n = 500$ in the left panel; we can see that it is approximately linear in p and n^2.

4 Conclusion

As seen in the previous section, our proposed algorithm — especially implemented in `Rcpp` — reduces the computational cost of the m.d. estimation method. Compared with other methods, it still remains competitive. However, it should be admitted that our proposed algorithm is good for the distance function with Lebesgue integration only even though it is most common and popular integration measure in the literature of the m.d. estimation. For example, Koul (2002) demonstrated that the d.f. of the error in the regression model should be recommended for the integration measure of the distance function when the errors are logistic random variables. The computational aspects of the m.d. estimation method with other integration measures are left unanswered and will form a future research.

References

[1] Dhar, S. K. (1991). Minimum distance estimation in an additive effects outliers model. *Ann. Statist.*, **19** 205-228.

[2] Dhar, S. K. (1992). Computation of certain minimum L_2-distance type estimators under the linear model. *Comm. Statist. Simulation Comput.*, **21** 203-220.

[3] Koul, H. L. (1985). Minimum distance estimation in linear regression with unknown error distributions. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, **3** 1-8.

[4] Koul, H. L. (1986). Minimum distance estimation and goodness-of-fit tests in first-order autoregression. *Ann. Statist.*, **14** 1194-1213.

[5] Koul, H. L. (2002). *Weighted empirical process in nonlinear dynamic models.* Springer, Berlin, Vol. 166.

[6] Koul, H. L. and DeWet, T. (1983). Minimum distance estimation in a linear regression model. *Ann. Statist.*, **11** 921-932.

[7] Parr, W. C. and Schucany, W. R. (1979). Minimum distance and robust estimation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **75** 616-624.

[8] Wolfowitz, J. (1957). Minimum distance estimation method. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **28** 75-88.